Vol. IX, No. 53 HUMAN EVENTS December 31, 1952

THE SAAR — A "FREE" POLICE STATE

By FREDA UTLEY

FROM 1948, when the Marshall Plan was inaugurated, up to June last, the United States contributed a total of 13.4 billion dollars to Europe in E.C.A. or M.S.A. aid. France, which received 2.7 billions, stands second only to England on the list of the beneficiaries of our bounty. The ostensible purpose of this dollar shower is the strengthening of the free world against the internal and external Communist menace. It may therefore interest the American taxpayer to hear how France runs the Saar, which is the part of Germany we allowed her to take over after the war.

There is no Gestapo or M.V.D. in the Saar. Nor are there any concentration camps in this little coal-rich territory inhabited by 960,000 Germans. The Saarlanders can damn the French and curse their puppet government in cafes, restaurants and other public places without being arrested. Yet one needs to spend only a few days in the Saar to sense the invisible pressures which create the atmosphere of a police state.

As the socialist leader Dr. Kurt Conrad said to me in Saarbrucken: "The French need not use force; they have enough influence without it."

This influence is due to the fact that the French, with our tacit consent, assumed almost the same degree of control over the Saar's economy and political life as Russia enjoys in the East German "People's Republic". And being more cultured, or better Marxists, than the Russians, the French find it unnecessary at present to back up their economic power with an apparatus of terror. They have felt secure in the knowledge that fear of unemployment and starvation — or of bankruptcy — is more effective than bayonets in keeping a conquered people docile.

The iron-hand-in-the-velvet-glove literally describes French rule over the Saar. For, besides taking outright possession of the coal mines as war booty, France has "sequestered" the German iron and steel plants. Sequestration is a Gallic euphemism for expropriation. The German owners retain a theoretical claim to that part of their property or investment which the French did not seize outright, but receive no income from it. The French run the plants and dispose of the profits.

Although some minor industries have been left in the hands of their German owners, they too are effectively controlled by means of France's banking monopoly and the Saar's

Copyright 1952 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inclusion in the French customs union. No manufacturer or merchant can obtain credits or either export or import licenses, if he incurs the displeasure of the French authorities. He is subject to the same burdensome and stultifying bureaucratic controls as his French counterpart, but, being without representation in the French chamber of Deputies, he has no possibility of voting to change the laws which stifle private enterprise.

In one way or another the whole population of the Saar is subject to the will of France, exercised either through direct economic pressure or through the puppet government headed by Dr. Johannes Hoffman. The miners work directly under French managers, supervisors and technicians. The iron and steel workers (with the exception of those employed by a Luxembourg company) work for French controlled enterprises. The railroads are also run by the French. Manufacturers and merchants who dare to insist that the Saar is German are subject to dire economic penalties.

I have in my possession a photostatic copy of a letter dated May 16, 1951, signed by Colonel Grandval, who under the titles of Military Governor, High Commissioner and Ambassador, has been French Gauleiter of the Saar since 1945. In this letter he informs the Paris Ministry of Foreign Affairs that he has "deemed it necessary to refuse all import facilities" to the R and R Becker concern, because "the principal shareholder of this company, M. Richard Becker, is President of the Democratic Party of the Saar, which party has a generally German nationalist tendency".

FROM THE MINERS AND STEEL workers and government office employees, to the manufacturers, merchants and shopkeepers, everyone knows that the price of free speech may be unemployment or ruin. And free speech is almost the only freedom the Saarlanders possess. They can vote only for candidates put up by the government parties, or for the Communist party. They are denied freedom of assembly and freedom of the press, and if they distribute the leaflets put out by the illegal "pro-German parties", they are fined or may be sent to prison for six months. These penalties do not of course compare in severity to the punishment meted out to recalcitrants in a Soviet satellite state. But, as Dr. Ney, leader of the banned Christian Democratic Party of the Saar, pointed out to me in Saarlouis:

"Fear of the unknown terrifies. We have almost a Russian type of terror here. And remember that the spirit of the people was broken by Nazi rule and war devastation, followed by hunger and French military rule. Everyone fears for his livelihood. We fear to talk to foreigners. Old friends look away when they meet my wife on the street. She sits alone at home because nearly everyone fears to be associated with us.

"Freedom from fear!" continued this descendant of Napoleon's Marshal Ney; "what a bitter joke. The gentlemen who rule us rail against Hitler but they have set up a similar system."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Businessmen in the Saar ask you not to telephone to them, and if you write, to send the letter to their secretary's private address or some other letterdrop. When you talk to people in the street or in restaurants and hotels, they look over their shoulders before replying.

A small manufacturer I talked to in a small Saar town begged me not to quote what he said because of his workers, who would lose their livelihood if French anger were aroused.

When Erich Ollenhauer (who is the late Dr. Schumacher's successor as leader of the German socialists), stated in the Bundestag on November 18, that Johannes Hoffman is the Grotewohl of the Saar, he was hardly exaggerating. For "Joho", Minister President of the Saar, heads a regime as subservient to France as the East German People's Republic is to Russia. Just as in Red satellite states where the only parties permitted to exist are those which support the Communist constitution and Russian control of the economy, so in the Saar no party may put up candidates for election or publish a newspaper, unless it stands for economic union with France and the Saar's political "autonomy".

THERE IS ONE NOTABLE and ominous exception to this prohibition in the Saar. The Communist party, alone among those opposing the union with France, is permitted to put up candidates for election and to publish a newspaper. If you wish to vote against the Government you can only vote Communist. When I asked the French official in charge of the press section of the *Mission Diplomatique* at Saarbrucken to explain why the Communist Party (which, like the forbidden C.D.U. and F.D.P. parties, insists that the Saar is German) nevertheless enjoys full political freedom, including the right to publish a newspaper, I received a strange reply. The young Frenchman explained that this was because reattachment to Germany constituted only one plank in the Communist Party platform, whereas it was the *raison d'étre* for the other "pro-German" parties! I was hardly surprised when later on in our conversation this Monsieur Chazel told me that he did not believe there was any danger of Communist aggression.

Colonel Grandval explained it differently. The Communist Party, he said, having been originally licensed by the victorious allies all over Germany, had retained its rights in the Saar. The trade union leaders I interviewed accused the French of using the Communists for propaganda purposes, and also for disrupting the unity of the workers.

The Saar miners are among the more resolute opponents of French rule. They resent the fact that France refuses them a collective bargaining agreement and that they receive the same wages as the French although they work harder and produce more. And the French seem to have singularly failed to establish the friendly human relationship between management and workers which is of particular importance in the mining industry.

The chairman of the Saar miners union, Paul Kutsch, was the first victim of the forcible measures taken by the French to suppress the opposition in the weeks before the election. On November 20 he was prevented by the police from entering his office and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had his automobile confiscated. Subsequently he and other miners' leaders were ousted from their posts by an *ad hoc* "court of arbitration" as punishment for their "pro-German attitude".

However, such acts of violence have been rare. The most potent weapon used by the French to secure a favorable election result was undoubtedly the threat to reinstitute French military Government in the Saar. For instance, on November 28, the semi-official newspaper, *Saarbrucker Zeitung,* came out with an editorial threatening the electors that if they failed to vote for Hoffman and the status quo, France would resume direct rule as the Occupation Power. And the Hoffman government itself distributed leaflets reminiscent of Goebbels or Communist propaganda methods, telling the population that failure to continue it in office would mean "war, ruin and destruction" and a repetition of all the sufferings they underwent during and after the war.

IN 1947 when the Saarlanders were faced with a choice of voting for economic union with France, or having their industries dismantled and being left to starve, West Germany lay in ruins and was being prevented by the Allies from rebuilding its shattered economy. But since the currency reform in 1948 and the stopping of dismantlement in 1949-50, the West Germans have been forging ahead, thanks to the willingness of Germans to work hard and long, and as a result of the free enterprise economy favored by the Bonn government. Thus today the desire of many of the Saarlanders to be reincorporated in their German homeland is reinforced by the attraction exerted by West German prosperity.

The Saarlanders have little confidence in the franc, which is the sole legal tender, and wish to invest their savings in marks, which are rapidly becoming as stable and valuable a currency as the Swiss franc. The cost of living is higher in the Saar and in France than in Germany. The more farsighted Saarlanders fear that, if there is a depression, France will exclude their manufacturers and, that they will be unable to compete against West German producers. For France has apparently denied to the Saar mines and iron works the share of Marshall plan aid necessary for their reconstruction and modernization.

The Saar shows up the basic problem which prevents European unification. It is not merely France's out-of-date nationalism that prevents the formation of a European Defense Community. It is rather the inability of the French (and their weak Government) to compete against the hardworking and energetic Germans. Unless and until the United States ceases to treat France as a favored child, entitled both to live on our bounty and to disregard all democratic principles, there can be no European unity. Reform in France is the *sine qua non* for the success of all such grandiose schemes as the Schuman plan.

ADDITIONAL COPIES: One—$.20; six—1.00; ten—1.50; fifty—5.50; one hundred—10.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Volume IX, No. 53 Wednesday, December 31, 1952 Washington, D. C.

JAN 7 '53

Korea: The Eisenhower-MacArthur plan to end the war and build the peace in Korea has been kept secret in better-than-usual fashion in Washington. But HUMAN EVENTS has managed to extract from some of the principals involved this much: that the plan is simple and implies rather a firmer and more courageous approach than it does any new military measures. We believe this information is correct.

But from other sources in the services we are in a position to reveal one segment of the plan (which involves some rather amazing doings, until now undisclosed to the American people, probably because of "Acheson-ism"). If a top-level decision to implement this part of the plan should be taken, a termination of the war might conceivably follow. It would depend, of course, on whether Dulles turns his back on "Acheson-ism".

The nub of the matter — as recommended to Ike by military circles — is as follows: Eisenhower must, as the first step, prepare for a strict naval blockade of China. The idea of a naval blockade is not new. But the "needle" in this project is new, since it has not been fully understood. Naturally, a blockade of coastal shipping would have a strongly adverse effect on the Chinese economy, since China has comparatively few railroads — much of its internal transport depending on coast-wise shipping. Stopping or reducing this transport would prove a severe blow to the Reds.

However — and here is the pay-off — the blockade of *high-seas shipping* can have even more effective results. This is not realized, for the astonishing facts about the matter have been kept from the public by "Acheson-ism" and the Truman censorship of the military during the past year.

The truth is that about a million tons of shipping have been carrying munitions from Europe and other places to Chinese ports. One of the important portions of this munitions delivery has been petroleum and lubricants — loaded in Black Sea ports. The ships carry Greek, Panamanian and Soviet satellite flags. But the vessels are almost entirely owned by Greek interests whose headquarters and bank accounts are in London. The British have never attempted to put a stop to this trade although they could do so easily. If the British people knew that not only American but also British soldiers die in Korea because of tanks and planes fuelled by the above-described channels, opinion in the United Kingdom might well force the British Government to abolish this unseemly traffic. In any case, real American pressure — so far never exerted — would accomplish the same result.

Right here lies the efficacy of an Eisenhower decision — if it's made — to enforce a complete blockade of shipping to China. The mere decision alone would probably suffice to bring British Government action to end the traffic. Such action would, without any fuss or publicity, severely curtail the kind of munitions without which the enemy could scarcely put up much of a show in Korea.

Prosperity Ahead: It is news when a socialist publication like the *New Leader* features two articles (December 1 and December 8) by an economist who frankly discounts the possibility of an early depression. The author is W. S. Woytinsky, now of Johns Hopkins University, formerly an economist for the Federal Security Administration. Late in the war Woytinsky came in conflict with his New Deal superiors when he insisted that the U.S. would not fall into a postwar depression, as Henry Wallace and others

Copyright 1952 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

Published weekly at 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were then forecasting. Again in 1949, this economist expressed doubt about the imminence of a recession at that time.

Today, Woytinsky takes an optimistic view of business prospects and minimizes the effects either of a stepping up or of a sudden ending of the war. "The economic system", he remarks, "working at full capacity is amazingly flexible and can absorb shocks which would be extremely dangerous under conditions of activity on a lower level." (He points to the ease with which the economy absorbed the shock of the steel strike during the past year.) "The momentum came", he says, "not from outside, not from war, rearmament and public spending, but from the economic system itself, from the economic genius of the nation. It has not been exhausted or weakened and is unlikely to be checked by changes in our ambiguous military and political situation." This economist apparently expects good times until 1955 at least.

Nor is he concerned about the shock of an early peace. If that should come there would be "an increase in civilian purchasing power which will result from a drastic reduction in taxes. . . . There is little doubt that civilians will know what to do with the additional funds left at their disposal as a result of a cut in taxes. As in 1945-6, the nation has a tremendous pent-up demand for all kinds of goods, for things which consumers 'could not afford' with the dependable income left them after taxes."

He also is at variance with President Truman who last week boasted that his Administration was responsible for prosperity since the war. Woytinsky says that the prosperity was not *planned* by the Government, but developed "with irresistible strength out of conditions which existed at the end of the war".

Spanish Bases — and Churchill: London last weekend apparently developed a case of nerves over reports that the United States would move most of the U.S. air force units in England to bases in Spain. The reports were denied in London, but in Washington we found government circles saying "there's something to it". The British — and particularly Premier Winston Churchill who will arrive in America next week — have reason to heed soberly these reports.

Britain's most valued "ace-in-the-hole" when negotiating with the U.S. has been the approximately 30 American air fields, the 35,000 American Air Force personnel and large numbers of planes based in England. The island has been the virtual aircraft carrier pointed toward Soviet Russia — from which U.S. bombers could deliver the atom bomb. Britain has found this a good bargaining point. If pacifism or neutralism (as expressed by British left-wingers) comes to the fore, Britain might move to deny use of its territory as a take-off place for such U.S. bomblings.

But the U.S., for its part, has seen fit to develop an "ace-in-the-hole" for America — namely, the Spanish bases which Franco reportedly has now granted us.

Over a year ago in this column, we exposed the fraudulent British pretension that the U.S. should not have close relations with "fascist" Spain. Actually, Britain does not fear Spanish fascism at all; it fears the creation of an alternate U.S. air base in Spain. If we had such a base, U.S. diplomacy could shrug off threats about Britain remaining neutral in case of war with Russia. Every time we would shrug, British demands for more dollar help would shrink.

Hence, the release of publicity on the possibility of moving American air bases to Spain was nicely timed — just as a reminder to London — on the eve of the British Premier's departure for the U.S.

Actually, the U.S. threat is no idle one. We talked today with Pentagon circles who said it might be "just as well" to take at least some of the air force now in Britain and to berth it in Spain. There are too many AF men on that island, they remarked, and they mentioned recent bad relations between our boys in blue and British civilians.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Realignment: Those desirous of closer working relations between Southern Democrats and Northern conservative Republicans are speculating about a mysterious trip recently taken by Senators Taft and Byrd. The Ohioan and the Virginian — warm political friends, despite their party labels — went to South Carolina and visited Governor James F. Byrnes of that state. Byrnes has been the bell-wether of the Southern Democrats who want an alliance with midwestern and small city Republicans in the North.

After the meeting, the three remained discreetly silent about what went on. Observers here speculate that some sort of realignment of these two conservative forces in the Congress is being planned.

This impression is heightened by various statements in the past fortnight by Sen. Karl Mundt, outstanding exponent of realignment. According to the *New York Times*, Mundt recommended that, for every GOP chairman of a committee in Congress, there should be a Southern Democratic "vice-chairman". Those who know congressional procedure can see no workability in such a scheme; it would only serve as a "symbol" of unity. They believe the Mundt statement was a "trial balloon" to test reactions in preparation for a more formal alliance of the North-South forces on the Congressional level.

Finally, last Saturday, Mundt predicted that when Congress reconvenes it will reach its major decisions through "a working combination of Republicans and Southern Democrats" and any legislation projected by General Eisenhower "must depend upon support of conservative Southern Democrats". This is interpreted as a sign that any combination of Northern Democrats and Northern Republican "liberals", in support of the anti-filibuster movement, would collide with a coalition of conservatives — Democrats and Republicans, North and South. A sharp profile of what many believe is the inevitable formal coalition of the latter may emerge in a rather striking way at the very beginning of the next session.

McCarran: Some Republicans propose that the Democratic author of the controversial immigration bill and the sworn enemy of Communists in Government and in the UN should be named head of a special committee of internal security under the Republican majority in the Senate. He may — if certain GOP strategists have their way — continue to head what has been the Internal Security sub-committee of the Judiciary Committee. The reasons advanced for such exceptional treatment of a prominent Democrat are as follows:

(1) The Republican leadership believes that McCarran ensured Republican control of the Senate by his support of GOP Senator Malone in Nevada. Pat McCarran turned against Malone's New Deal Democratic opponent. The GOP will have a majority of only one in the Senate when the new Congress starts.

(2) Most of the GOP leaders in Congress are midwesterners, very anti-Communist and very admiring of the senior Senator from Nevada. They are now impressed by the indictment of Lattimore, following McCarran's recommendations for Department of Justice action against the man whom McCarthy called "the architect" of Administration policy in the Far East.

(3) If McCarran is given a post as head of a special committee investigating subversives, it would ensure continuity of the work he has been doing, with maintenance of the present valuable staff.

Finally, there is a precedent. Sen. Byrd, also a Democrat, was similarly honored by GOP Senate Leadership in the 80th Congress (1946-8). He was allowed to continue as head of a special committee, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the "economy" group. It is rumored that Byrd will again be allowed to head the same committee in the next Congress.

Lattimore: The indictment of Professor Owen Lattimore, accused of pro-Soviet activities by Senator McCarthy, has inspired speculation as to who will serve as Prosecutor for the Department of Justice, during a trial which may rival the two trials of Alger Hiss. It is recalled how a virtually unknown figure,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Thomas Murphy, leaped to fame as the prosecutor of Hiss. Right after taking office as Attorney General, Herbert Brownell may have to reach down into the existing Department personnel for a prosecutor; and he would do well if he selected one Department lawyer, Roy Cohn, to present the Government's case against Lattimore.

Cohn has attracted much praise and attention recently for his work on the case of Lattimore, in which he persuaded the Federal Grand Jury to hand down an indictment. He is thoroughly versed in the details of the matter at hand, and is reported to be an excellent cross-questioner. Cohn has also worked on the cases of the atom bomb spies now under sentence of death and on the case of William Remington, convicted on the charge of perjury for denying he was ever a Communist.

If Cohn should be selected, he will probably be billed as the child prodigy among prosecutors. He graduated from Columbia law school at the age of 19 and he is now 25.

Labor: One of the most important figures in the labor movement has issued a call to organized labor to "revise its political aims and techniques". President M. A. Hutcheson of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, writing in the union organ, *The Carpenter* (December issue), tells his membership that the present policy of the AFL in taking sides in elections is unsound and that the movement should get back to the policy of Samuel Gompers who urged labor to avoid partisan politics and to pursue a policy of "electing your friends and defeating your enemies" regardless of party labels. "In its first defection from that policy", Hutcheson remarks, "the Federation [AFL] tied its political fortunes to a specific candidate who went down to defeat."

As Hutcheson puts it: "labor plunged itself so deeply into the political arena and fared so poorly in election after election that the time has certainly arrived for taking a serious look at the entire picture." He suggests that it is "fairly obvious" that a good deal of the labor vote must have gone to General Eisenhower, "despite the exhortations of the Federation". He believes that union members consider themselves quite capable of making up their own minds "without any direction from anyone". And he expresses the suspicion that there was "resentment" among labor union members against labor bosses who thought they knew what was politically best for members. He did not like the publicity of labor in the campaign.

"If there is any moral in all this", says Hutcheson, "it seems to me that it must be that American workers should not be underestimated either as to intelligence, independence or ability to make decisions for themselves. . . ."

Court Historians: Those who work for the revision of "propaganda history" were pleased with a speech given by Professor Howard K. Beale at a meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association in Washington on December 28. Beale attacked historians who "are apparently delighted to cooperate in the policy of Government censorship by accepting commissions to write history under Government blessing or even Government assignment from archives open to them but closed to others who are therefore unable to check them and contradict them".

Beale emphasized that such a system of letting only a selected few whose views conform to the official Government policy see otherwise secret documents "can destroy our freedom of research and ultimately make what we write suspect". He expressed doubt about the value of the detailed histories of our armed forces written by official historians at "colossal" cost to the taxpayers.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED